

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

CRIMINAL MISC.APPLICATION No 427 of 1998

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.K.TRIVEDI

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

-----  
VASANTBHAI B.PARMAR

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

-----  
Appearance:

MR BHARAT T RAO for Petitioner

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for Respondent No. 1

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.K.TRIVEDI

Date of decision: 05/03/98

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Rule. Ld.Addl.PP Mr.K.T.Dave waives service of rule. With the consent of learned advocates for parties matter is finally heard.

2. The petitioner has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail on the apprehension that he is likely to be arrested in respect to offences registered vide

Cr.No.0039/98 at Anand Police Station, Dist.Anand in respect to offences made punishable under sections 307, 406, 420 read with section 1143 IPC.

3. Shri Bharat Rao, Ld.advocate appearing for the petitioner has taken me through the averments made in the FIR and has read that one of the missing cheques appears to have been deposited in the Savings Account of the present petitioner and withdrawal by the cheque is made. That the petitioner has never applied for issuance of cheque book. However, on the said allegation the police is likely to arrest him. That the person committed any offence and circumstances show that he is trapped by somebody.

4. On perusal of police papers it appears that the petitioner has been serving in the same of the LIC as a Peon since last ten years, and along with the present petitioner two other peons are also suspected for the missing cheques which appears to have been used in the commission of said offence under which amount has been deposited in the account of the present petitioner and has been withdrawn.

5. Considering the nature of accusations made against the present petitioner I do not deem it just or proper to grant anticipatory bail at this stage and hence the petition stands disposed of as rejected. Rule is discharged. No costs.

...